



Texas Department of Insurance
Division of Workers' Compensation
Medical Fee Dispute Resolution, MS-48
7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1609

MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION

Requestor Name and Address: PROVIDENCE MEMORIAL HOSPITAL PO BOX 849763 DALLAS, TX 75284	MFDR Tracking #: M4-07-6924-01
	DWC Claim #: 07139877
	Injured Employee: EVANGELINA CARDENAS
Respondent Name and Carrier's Austin Representative Box #: NEW HAMPSHIRE INSURANCE CO Box #: 19	Date of Injury: 06/13/06
	Employer Name: TENET HEALTHCARE CORP
	Insurance Carrier #: YLLC25368

PART II: REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Requestor's Position Summary: "Please allow this letter to serve as a formal appeal in response to the above referenced claim. Medically necessary services were rendered to your member as ordered; yet reimbursement of the claim was not in accordance with the contract terms agreed by our facility and your organization. It is requested that you remit additional payment immediately."

Amount in Dispute: \$2,149.00

PART III: RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Respondent's Position Summary as stated on the Respondent's Rationale for Maintaining the Reduction or Denial, located on the Table of Disputed Services: "Provider previously reimbursed by carrier – see attached."

Response Submitted by: Specialty Risk Services, 300 S. State St., Syracuse, NY 13202

PART IV: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Date(s) of Service	Denial Code(s)	Disputed Service	Amount in Dispute	Amount Due
06/20/2006	89, 193	Outpatient Radiological Services	\$2,149.00	\$0.00
Total Due:				\$0.00

PART V: REVIEW OF SUMMARY, METHODOLOGY AND EXPLANATION

Texas Labor Code § 413.011(a-d), titled *Reimbursement Policies and Guidelines*, and Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1, titled *Medical Reimbursement*, effective May 2, 2006 set out the reimbursement guidelines.

This request for medical fee dispute resolution was received by the Division on June 15, 2007.

- For the services involved in this dispute, the respondent reduced or denied payment with reason code:
 - 89 – Professional fees removed from charges, services billed for radiology, lab, and/or pathology by a hosp, should normally be billed at the TC rate.
 - 193 – Original payment decision is being maintained. Final Action. In accordance with Rule 133.250(G): "A health care provider shall not resubmit a request for reconsideration after the carrier has taken final action on the request."
- Although the Carrier did not deny the disputed service due to a contractual agreement, the health care provider stated in their position summary that "reimbursement of the claim was not in accordance with the contract terms agreed by our facility and your organization." Review of both party's documentation shows that neither party submitted a copy of neither a contract nor any information to support that a contractual agreement exists between the parties to this dispute. These services will therefore be reviewed per applicable Division rules and fee guidelines.
- This dispute relates to services with reimbursement subject to the provisions of Division rule at 28 TAC §134.1, effective May 2, 2006, 31 TexReg 3561, which requires that, in the absence of an applicable fee guideline, reimbursement for health care not provided through a workers' compensation health care network shall be made in

accordance with subsection §134.1(d) which states that “Fair and reasonable reimbursement: (1) is consistent with the criteria of Labor Code §413.011; (2) ensures that similar procedures provided in similar circumstances receive similar reimbursement; and (3) is based on nationally recognized published studies, published Division medical dispute decisions, and values assigned for services involving similar work and resource commitments, if available.”

4. Texas Labor Code §413.011(d) requires that fee guidelines must be fair and reasonable and designed to ensure the quality of medical care and to achieve effective medical cost control. The guidelines may not provide for payment of a fee in excess of the fee charged for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living and paid by that individual or by someone acting on that individual's behalf. It further requires that the Division consider the increased security of payment afforded by the Act in establishing the fee guidelines.
5. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(B), effective December 31, 2006, 31 TexReg 10314, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 15, 2007, requires that the request shall include “a copy of each explanation of benefits (EOB)... relevant to the fee dispute or, if no EOB was received, convincing documentation providing evidence of carrier receipt of the request for an EOB.” Review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the request does not include copies of any EOBs for the disputed services. Nor has the requestor provided evidence of carrier receipt of the request for an EOB. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(B).
6. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(F)(i), effective December 31, 2006, 31 TexReg 10314, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 15, 2007, requires that the request shall include a position statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include “a description of the health care for which payment is in dispute.” Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor has not provided a description of the health care for which payment is in dispute. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(F)(i).
7. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(F)(iii), effective December 31, 2006, 31 TexReg 10314, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 15, 2007, requires that the request shall include a position statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include “how the Labor Code, Division rules, and fee guidelines impact the disputed fee issues.” Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor has not discussed how the Labor Code, Division rules and fee guidelines impact the disputed fee issues. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(F)(iii).
8. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(F)(iv), effective December 31, 2006, 31 TexReg 10314, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 15, 2007, requires that the request shall include a position statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include “how the submitted documentation supports the requestor position for each disputed fee issue.” Review of the requestor's documentation finds that the requestor has not discussed how the submitted documentation supports the requestor position for each disputed fee issue. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(F)(iv).
9. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(G), effective December 31, 2006, 31 TexReg 10314, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 15, 2007, requires the requestor to provide “documentation that discusses, demonstrates, and justifies that the amount being sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement in accordance with §134.1 of this title (relating to Medical Reimbursement) when the dispute involves health care for which the Division has not established a maximum allowable reimbursement (MAR), as applicable.” Review of the submitted documentation finds that:
 - The requestor did not submit a position statement for consideration in this dispute.
 - The requestor's position asserts that “reimbursement of the claim was not in accordance with the contract terms agreed by our facility and your organization.”
 - The requestor did not submit documentation to support that “reimbursement of the claim was not in accordance with the contract terms agreed by our facility and your organization.”
 - The requestor does not discuss or explain how “reimbursement of the claim was not in accordance with the contract terms agreed by our facility and your organization” supports the requestor's position that the amount sought is a fair and reasonable reimbursement for the services in dispute.
 - The requestor has not articulated a methodology under which fair and reasonable reimbursement should be calculated.
 - The requestor does not discuss or explain how payment of “reimbursement of the claim was not in accordance with the contract terms agreed by our facility and your organization” would result in a fair and reasonable reimbursement for the services in dispute.
 - The requestor did not submit documentation to support that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement.
 - The Division has previously found that a reimbursement methodology based upon payment of a hospital's billed charges, or a percentage of billed charges, does not produce an acceptable payment amount. This methodology was considered and rejected by the Division in the *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline* adoption preamble which states at 22 Texas Register 6276 (July 4, 1997) that:

"A discount from billed charges was another method of reimbursement which was considered. Again, this method was found unacceptable because it leaves the ultimate reimbursement in the control of the hospital, thus defeating the statutory objective of effective cost control and the statutory standard not to pay more than for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living. It also provides no incentive to contain medical costs, would be administratively burdensome for the Commission and system participants, and would require additional Commission resources."

- The Division has previously found that a reimbursement methodology based on hospital costs does not produce a fair and reasonable reimbursement amount. This methodology was considered and rejected by the Division in the *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline* adoption preamble which states at 22 Texas Register 6276 (July 4, 1997) that:

"The Commission [now the Division] chose not to adopt a cost-based reimbursement methodology. The cost calculation on which cost-based models... are derived typically use hospital charges as a basis. Each hospital determines its own charges. In addition, a hospital's charges cannot be verified as a valid indicator of its costs... Therefore, under a so-called cost-based system a hospital can independently affect its reimbursement without its costs being verified. The cost-based methodology is therefore questionable and difficult to utilize considering the statutory objective of achieving effective medical cost control and the standard not to pay more than for similar treatment to an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living contained in Texas Labor Code §413.011. There is little incentive in this type of cost-based methodology for hospitals to contain medical costs."

- The requestor did not submit nationally recognized published studies, published Division medical dispute decisions, or documentation of values assigned for services involving similar work and resource commitments to support the requested reimbursement.
- The requestor did not discuss or explain how payment of the requested amount would satisfy the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §134.1.

The request for additional reimbursement is not supported. Thorough review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not demonstrated or justified that payment of the amount sought would be a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement for the services in dispute. Additional payment cannot be recommended.

10. The Division would like to emphasize that individual medical fee dispute outcomes rely upon the evidence presented by the requestor and respondent during dispute resolution, and the thorough review and consideration of that evidence. After thorough review and consideration of all the evidence presented by the parties to this dispute, it is determined that the submitted documentation does not support the reimbursement amount sought by the requestor. The Division concludes that this dispute was not filed in the form and manner prescribed under Division rules at 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(c)(2)(B), §133.307(c)(2)(F)(i), §133.307(c)(2)(F)(iii), §133.307(c)(2)(F)(iv) and §133.307(c)(2)(G). The Division further concludes that the requestor failed to support its position that additional reimbursement is due. As a result, the amount ordered is \$0.00.

PART VI: GENERAL PAYMENT POLICIES/REFERENCES

Texas Labor Code §413.011(a-d), §413.031 and §413.0311
28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307, §134.1
Texas Government Code, Chapter 2001, Subchapter G

PART VII: DIVISION DECISION

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code §413.031, the Division has determined that the requestor is not entitled to additional reimbursement for the services involved in this dispute.

DECISION:

Authorized Signature

Marguerite Foster

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer

08/30/11

Date

PART VIII: YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST AN APPEAL

Either party to this medical fee dispute has a right to request an appeal. A request for hearing must be in writing and it must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **20** (twenty) days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. **Please include a copy of the Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision** together with other required information specified in Division rule at 28 TAC §148.3(c).

Under Texas Labor Code §413.0311, your appeal will be handled by a Division hearing under Title 28 Texas Administrative Code Chapter 142 Rules if the total amount sought does not exceed \$2,000. If the total amount sought exceeds \$2,000, a hearing will be conducted by the State Office of Administrative Hearings under Texas Labor Code §413.031.

Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.